

**REMARKS**

The present application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated July 28, 2006. Claims 1-17 have been cancelled, without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter presented therein. Claims 18-27 are presented for examination and are newly added to provide Applicants with a more complete scope of protection. Claims 18 and 23 are the only claims in independent form. Support for the claims may be found in the specification at, for example, paragraphs 9, 10, 15, 22, 23, and 43-45. It is respectfully submitted that the changes to the claims add no new matter to the original disclosure. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 9 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Office Action states that Claim 9 recites a singular requirement in the language "any one of a ..." The Office Action further states that the claim also recites: "JSP, HTML, ASP, *and* PHP," and that the use of the word "and" suggests that not one but instead all of those elements are included. Claims 9 and 16 have been canceled; however, similar language is presented in Claims 21 and 26. Specifically, Claims 21 and 26 recite: "wherein the file type is one of: JSP, HTML, ASP and PHP." Applicants respectfully submit that the grammar of this recitation is not indefinite and clearly states that the file type is one of the listed group. In support of Applicants' position, it is noted that the MPEP uses analogous language in an example of a properly worded multiple-dependent claim:

A. Acceptable Multiple Dependent Claim Wording

Claim 5. A gadget according to claims 3 or 4, further comprising ---

Claim 5. A gadget as in any one of the preceding claims, in which ---

Claim 5. A gadget as in *any one of claims 1, 2, and 3*, in which ---

\*\*\*\*\*

MPEP 608.01(n) (emphasis added). Applicants also respectfully submit that it would be grammatically incorrect to recite the listed group as "JSP, HTML, ASP *or* PHP," because the group includes all of those four elements. Accordingly, withdrawal of the indefiniteness rejections is respectfully requested.

**Prior Art Rejections**

Claims 1-6, 9, 11, 12, and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0123334 (Borger). Claims 7, 8, 10, 13-15, and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Borger in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,948,117 ("Van Eaton"). As mentioned above, these claims have been cancelled, thus rendering their rejections moot. The patentability of the newly added claims with respect to the cited references is discussed below.

Borger is understood to relate to systems, methods, and computer program products that can insert content into Web documents for display by wireless client devices. *See* Borger, par. [0020]. A user sends a request for a Web document from a wireless client device to a Web server via a communications network and the Web server, upon receiving the user request, sends a request to a second server (*e.g.*, a third party ad server) for additional content (*e.g.*, an

advertisement) to be included within the requested Web document. *See* Borger, par. [0020]. The location of the additional content is identified within the Web document by markup tags. The markup tags may also specify additional information, such as the format of the content. The content selected by the second server for inclusion with the Web document may not have the format specified by the markup tags within the Web document. *See* Borger, par. [0022]. In such a case, the second server transcodes the selected content to the format specified by the markup tags. *See* Borger, par. [0022]. The second server sends transcoded content having the format specified by the markup tags to the first server, which subsequently serves the Web document to the wireless client device with the additional content included therein. *See* Borger, par. [0022].

It is well settled that a "claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Applicants submit that Borger fails to teach or suggest "a method for facilitating editing of webpage interface elements, the method comprising: obtaining an XML tag identifying a selected webpage interface element, wherein the XML tag is utilized in a plurality of webpages to identify a plurality of occurrences of the selected webpage interface element; accessing a configuration file corresponding to the XML tag, wherein the configuration file provides data formatting rules for the selected webpage interface element, based on the XML tag; and editing the configuration file to change the data formatting rules for the selected webpage interface element, wherein the changed data formatting rules resulting from the edited

configuration file changes an appearance of the selected webpage interface element in the plurality of webpages," as recited in Claim 18.

Borger is silent regarding a method for facilitating the editing of webpage interface elements. As discussed above, Borger merely discloses systems, methods, and computer program products for inserting content into Web documents for display by client devices. Thus, Borger does not teach or suggest each and every element set forth in Claim 18. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 18 is patentable over Borger.

Independent Claim 23 recites features similar to those of Claim 18 and therefore is also believed to be patentable over Borger for the reasons discussed above. Claims 19-22 depend from Claim 18, and Claims 24-27 depend from Claim 23. For at least the reasons discussed above, these dependent claims are respectfully submitted to be patentable over Borger.

Further, Applicants respectfully submit that any permissible combination of Borger and Van Eaton would not teach or suggest a "method for facilitating editing of webpage interface elements, the method comprising: obtaining an XML tag identifying a selected webpage interface element, wherein the XML tag is utilized in a plurality of webpages to identify a plurality of occurrences of the selected webpage interface element; accessing a configuration file corresponding to the XML tag, wherein the configuration file provides data formatting rules for the selected webpage interface element, based on the XML tag; and editing the configuration file to change the data formatting rules for the selected webpage interface element, wherein the changed data formatting rules resulting from the edited configuration file changes an appearance of the selected webpage interface element in the plurality of webpages," as recited in Claim 18.

Van Eaton fails to remedy the deficiencies of Borger. Consequently, a combination of Borger and Van Eaton, assuming such combination would even be proper, would fail to teach or suggest all the features recited of the claims.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and an early passage to issue of the present application.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Lock See Yu-Jahnes/  
Lock See Yu-Jahnes  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 38,667

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3801  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY\_Main 612598\_1